

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 14-28 and 37 are pending. By this amendment, the title and claims 1-5, 17, 18 and 28 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 1 and 3 of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 4-13, 15, 16 and 19-27.

Title Objection

In the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to for not being descriptive. The title has been amended to read

-- PLASMA DISPLAY PANEL HAVING A NON-LIGHT EMITTING ZONE FILLING
PORTION --.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the title.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4 and 5 were objected to for reciting “non-light emitting zone portion” instead of “non-light emitting zone filling portion”. Applicants amended claims 1, 4 and 5, as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the objection to claims 1, 4 and 5. These amendments are made for the sole purpose of correcting the claimed features and not for the purpose of avoiding prior art or narrowing the claimed invention, and no change in claim scope is intended. Therefore, Applicants do not intend to relinquish any subject matter by these amendments. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4 and 5, as amended, overcome the stated objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection for claims 1, 4 and 5.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 17, 18, 28 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP5135702 (“JP ‘702”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,754,003 issued to Murai, *et al.* (“Murai”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, Applicants submit that the object of JP ‘702 is to provide dummy ribs 6 in order to help unify the film thickness between barrier ribs and to prevent the generation of recesses (Abstract). Secondly, Applicants submit that in all the embodiments of JP ‘702 at least some space exists between the outermost partition defining the active area of the display and the dummy ribs 6. For example, in Figure 1 of JP ‘702, there is a space between the outermost partition of the active area (i.e., between the last partition which is adjacent to an anode electrode

2 and the first dummy rib 6). In Figure 6, after the outermost partition (i.e., the last solid area adjacent to a cell having an intersection of an anode electrode 2 and the electrode 4), the dummy portion extending from the outermost partition has spaces therein and thus, no surface of the dummy partition (i.e., the portion of barrier rib 5 beginning after the last solid area of the barrier rib 5 which is adjacent to a cell having an intersection of an anode electrode 2 and the electrode 4) is in direct contact with an outermost partition along the length of the outermost partition. Finally, Applicants submit that in view of the objective of JP '702, discussed above, it is not necessary to provide a filling portion which is in direct contact with the outermost partition wall defining a cell which is in the active area of a display because the aim is solely to provide additional partitions beyond the active area so that the film may have a more uniform thickness.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of JP '702 and Murai fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel comprising the combination of features recited in claim 1 including a zone defined between an outermost one of said partitions and the sealing material is at least partially filled with a filling material used for one of said partitions and the zone has a length in the first direction which is substantially a length of the outermost partition in the first direction and at least one surface of the filling material is in direct contact with an outermost surface of the outermost partition along the length of zone.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of JP '702 and Murai fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel comprising the combination of features recited in claim 2, including a non-light emitting zone filling portion filling a non-light emitting zone defined between an outermost one of said partitions and the sealing material, said non-light emitting zone filling portion comprising a material used for one of said partitions, wherein said outermost partition and said non-light emitting zone filling portion are substantially formed

integrally and at least one surface of the non-light emitting zone filling portion is in contact with the dielectric layer on the front glass substrate or the dielectric layer on the rear glass substrate along a width of the non-light emitting zone portion from an outermost surface of the outermost partition to an innermost surface of the sealing material.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the combination of JP '702 and Murai fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel comprising the combination of features recited in claim 3, including wherein a zone defined between an outermost one of said partitions and the sealing material is substantially completely filled with a material comprising a material used for one of said partitions.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of JP '702 and Murai fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel comprising the combination of features recited in claim 17, including a non-light emitting zone filling portion disposed between an outermost one of said partitions and said seal so as to prevent a discharge of the first electrodes in a space between said outermost partition and said seal, wherein said non-light emitting zone filling portion is connected to and has a same height as said outermost partition and at least one surface of the non-light emitting zone portion is in contact with the dielectric layer on the front glass substrate or the dielectric layer on the rear glass substrate along a width of the non-light emitting zone portion from an outermost surface of the outermost partition to an innermost surface of the sealing material and another surface of the non-light emitting zone portion is in contact with substantially all of the outermost surface of the outermost partition. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the combination of JP '702 and Murai also fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in claim 18, which depends from claim 17.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of JP ‘702 and Murai fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel comprising the combination of features recited in claim 28, including a non-light emitting zone filling portion is disposed between an outermost one of said partitions and said seal to prevent a discharge of the first electrodes in a space between said outermost partition and said seal, wherein an inert gas is disposed within the plasma display panel except between the space defined between said outermost partition and said seal and the non-light emitting zone filling portion substantially completely covers a surface of at least one of the first dielectric layer and the second dielectric layer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of JP ‘702 and Murai fails to disclose or suggest a plasma display panel comprising the combination of features recited in claim 37, including partitions formed on an upper surface of the second dielectric layer between the edges of said rear glass substrate, an outermost one of the partitions extending to said seal so as to prevent a discharge of the first electrodes in a space between said outermost partition and said seal.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1-3, 17, 18, 28 and 37. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 2, 3, 17, 18, 28 and 37 are allowable.

***Comments on Examiner’s Statement of Reasons for Allowance
Regarding the Subject Matter of Claims 4-13, 15, 16 and 19-27:***

While Applicants do not disagree with the Examiner's determination that the inventions recited in the claims are patentable over the references of record, Applicant objects to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance ("RFA") in the December 4, 2003 Office Action for the following reasons. Applicant respectfully submits that each of the claims in this application defines separate inventions, which recite different combinations of features, and the basis for the patentability of each claim is based upon the totality of the features recited in each claim. The summary of claim limitations from a single independent claim renders the RFA vague and indefinite, and possibly subject to unintended interpretations not anticipated by the Examiner or the Applicant. Moreover, while Applicants believe that the claims are allowable, Applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in each feature exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability of each claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 17, 18, 28 and 37, in addition to already allowed claims 4-13, 15, 16 and 19-27 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: March 4, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:MMI/bjb

\COM\375986.1